IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHASE BANK USA, N.A.,)
Plaintiff,)
) Civil Action No.
V.)
)
EVELYN L. HILLIS,)
)
Defendant.)
	j

COMPLAINT/MOTION OF PLAINTIFF CHASE BANK USA, N.A., FOR CONFIRMATION OF ARBITRATION AWARD

Pursuant to Rules 54 and 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and of the Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA"), 9 U.S.C. §§ 9 and 13, plaintiff Chase Bank USA, N.A. ("Chase"), moves the Court to enter a final judgment by confirming an arbitration award. The award was entered pursuant to the rules of the American Arbitration Association ("AAA").

As grounds for its motion, Chase states as follows:

- 1. In or about August 2003, Evelyn Hillis ("Hillis") opened a credit card account with Chase (the "Account"). The Account was governed at all times by a cardmember agreement ("CMA"), a facsimile copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 2. Pursuant to the CMA, disputes between Chase and Hillis are to be resolved through binding arbitration. On or about March 12, 2006, Hillis filed an Arbitration Claim with the AAA.

- 3. Hillis' Demand for Arbitration alleged violations of the Fair Credit Billing Act ("FCBA"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 1666-1666j, and the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 1601-1667f.
- 4. Hillis' claims are based on a series of form letters sent to Chase beginning in July 2005. Hillis' form letters were identical in all material respects, differing only in dates and numerical amounts. These letters alleged that Chase had committed numerous violations of the FCBA. The form letters stated in pertinent part:

My belief that the statements contain billing errors under 15 U.S.C. 1666(b)(1), (2) and (5) is based upon my belief that you failed to give all the proper disclosures required by law to me prior to opening this account, and additional disclosures since then. Because you failed to provide these disclosures, the account could not legally be opened and I should not be responsible for the payment of interest, fees or other finance charges. While I understand I will likely still be responsible fore the repayment of purchases and cash advances, I do not believe I should be responsible for interest, finance charges and other fees....

(A true and correct copy of Hillis' July 25, 2005 letter to Chase is attached hereto as Exhibit B.)

- 5. On February 13, 2007, Arbitrator David J. Armstrong issued an Award that dismissed, with prejudice, all of Hillis' claims asserted in her Arbitration Claim. (A true and correct copy of the Award is attached hereto as Exhibit C.)
- 6. Pursuant to §§ 9 and 13 of the FAA, Chase requests that the Court adopt and confirm the Award attached hereto and enter final judgment in accordance with said Stipulated Award.

By:

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2-26-07

Jonathan T. Krassenstein

Pa. ID #52095

Toni L. DiGiacobbe

Pa. ID #56686

Krassenstein & Associates **Professional Corporation** 7500 Brooktree Drive Wexford, PA 15090 (724) 935-6227

Attorney for Chase Bank USA, N.A.

Cardmember Agreement

In a the Apparence by restables the terms of you Carbinember Account ("Account") with fair a the Apparence by accounts operate with an about of the marks and principle to not Accessed about the company and whate a term may be not the term ("Apparence by the principle of the Marks Carbinember to expense and whate a term may be not the term (apparence) and a contract the principle of the principle of the first term (apparence) and the principle of the principle o

Diligillers to You describt. You appreciate a comprehensive and charge varieties of any control of the state of the control of

Abdrallone, Ray edon, rifigoria or ectronomy: ("Law ") he rifly was or or appear do part, or player in price frequent, and the control of the

Rafasti To Hener Candi VIII are not imponsible the rafashi to bened your Cand or Economicse Cheeks And, except the ditembree dequired by applicable day of republices, was not not be reatherphys for marchitecture or manuscreptionated or Annual Drough uno of your Account

(a) You must have made the purchase in your home uses of a not within you'r home state within 100 made of you covered making address, and bell to purchase parco must have been more than \$50. The purchase parco must have been more than \$50. This familyout to be subjet at any one of optimits the marchail, or it was makel you the advicasiment for the property or services.

litegolar Psytherets And Delay in Colorcumant: We can recept but poyments, ported pariment, checks and monty potent marked "Bald a full" or inspecing having the same effect without ships, may of an upfort upon the first parament. We can the delay solution, but rights inches that approach any under the transport and the same of the same they are the bown in Pariment of the same of the sam

YOUR BILLING RIGHTS

Xesp This Moles for future Use
The rocks content was mappine inference themselved by a first future for the first of case of terms of classical about year lights and our exponsibilities under the face (cold Birdy etc.)

Altify Us for an exposure themselved by the must be understand about the cold by the first for the second passible. We must be from your delice than 50 days after you be classified to expose a possible to be must be found to case of the first of any social your delice than 50 days after your delice.

One name and excessive year right.

**Possible to the excessive property of the first of the first of the possible to the first of the first of the possible to the first of the possible to the first of t

il was correct.

If we have a problem min the quality of emplanty of services that you purchased with a crash card, and you have their is good light to content the problem with the merchant, you may have the piph not to stay the amusting amount due on the property or services. There are two ferbilities on that right:

R1

ther the terrelessor freed and, the Stady Endode States was use to determine your Philipse FUNKET CHARGE In point from the bioticists and Chara Annuace bounces are worshifted Stary are east. "Standard Regist." They wan extended to make men and his point are and and a such can custom or determine they moved to provide the class was be excluded path mouth to the fur-ture of determine they moved to provide the classified U.S. prime rate policities of the foreign burners day of they are the first they want and the U.S. prime rate policities of the foreign burners day of they are the first they want and the U.S. prime rate policytes. to Day, Pennar Ray we 157 to diterant your Project EMANCE CHARGE for Automote business by that but 5 being events bisharing the distance of your Account life "Inventional Penna", a 3 hardested (0, composing to an ANRAIA, PENCIATING NATI pick.

South Award Was in the model kell proceding Determination Date. The Tetromodern Date is the Date Award Was in the model for the date and the date of t

De Japh 11, 2003. The prover one west 4.25% Upong shid prover site as an exemple, your Disky. Provide Say for Trachist shadest, weight equal District and the Annual Personation Rate weight regul 11 geV, MoV, 2000, Dank France Ratin (of Asso Advisors Indicates would attack District and Intelligence Personation, Ratin would regul 19 45%.

for adjusted hate for late payer: see "Finance charges for late payment"

Cash Advance FINANCE CHARGE	
ATM CASE Advance	2% of Carth Appearce
	(With J oxfortum of \$10,00)
All Olber Carb Edvisces	1% of Cash Advance
	with a monorous of \$10,000
Parametian FINANCE CHARGE	waterwest spiresodde ja 18.6
	funth a minimum of \$5.00
	Jad a Numpum of \$50.00)
BHONE PRINCIPE SINANCE CHARGE	technistrati approprieta
	fivility a management of \$5.00
	end a maximum of \$50,000
Minimum FMANCE CHARGE	212
If any fewner Charge is payable for a monthly being cyclai	
tarusi Manto resti p Fee	None
Dibbe beitenst Charges.	

If we have "special" passible axis albus in whetathorn inters to limit, we will seducity friendity than on the local of your externess and a specialogy disclose the photocas to which the appoint about a stances and the related frames Charjes with the calculated in the same invaries disclosed above.

Administrative I see.

Return Payment Fee Kohim Consumers of Ehach Fest

Dupicaje of Merchant Sale Sky Dupicaje Copy of Merch's Balling Statement

Grack Puriod: Puriodic FINANGE CHARGES are added to your between the war. of the waresched dat of the Registring of the 1-day eyes in well help are excelled to your Accord Lockes Pail bey are charged or Convenience Create from the day the excelled being beyoid. They continue to be udded until the review create prime with the According to the udded until the review prime with the According to the charge prime of the According the prime disc PANANGE CHARDES on the Areas prime and the according to the Charles and According to the Charles and According to the Charles and Balles and Balles and the According to the Charles and Balles and Balles.

We light staby jorian of the Faster Divige to your Account by stadings to stability Cath Advance FIRLANCE CHAINED to stab Cash Advance women in a strand. The smooth of the Cath Advance FIRLANCE CHAINED is stand in the labball history Chaines I Leva use year Cerd es Accason la cha a Bantus Dorder, partiuss monte entite et vivor manifers successivos se quebase statestis estates de beopen cumoner et toto filos a de bah, se ef sen usa Gonorieno Circo, ver successivos a poes como Tasasa el Dasielle E et Adolf e es noto una Balance Teanber, Bantus e et rest

riagh in he avoint riage is the Tible of Project Diviges. The project good be the son of the Periodic The least Parago Cardy of the Market Diviges and be the son of the Periodic Thianness can be sone of the Arterior Relatives (Thianness and my Diviged on Fillianness Fillianness Cardy Car

Finance Charges for Late Permann: Il you de rei may at faat the Ninescan Khoaby Perman ih ibe Paywent Dia the cent ma dowly the productory feriod, this inteclationy forbodish and sed be glanded Rate on fluctuates decorded in the Sale of Hajaraj Clurges will also allest at othe fast day of the Differy section belowing your last payment.

If you do not play all learn the thickness, fritandly playment by a first you do not play a list and the play playment by a first country to an adjusted and to OpiNIA.

Contraspolating to an ANNIAL ERECENT PLEATER AND THE AND ALL THE ARTHUR AREA TO A AREA THE AREA TO A AREA THE ARE

Maintrum Massily Paymait I lik Avio Bisters illiano av posi mostly sistement il viss than \$10 Q, typo Almony Mostly Paymait light by the Payman Des Qist of 3 on the Bisters dillianous, in a Almonium Massily Paymait light by the Payman Des Qist of 3 on the Bisters dillianous, in a Almonium Massily Payman is a stock policy of the paymait of 1100 or in light of (1) (22 di in a Almonium Massily Payman is a stock) that go the paymait of 1100 or in light of (1) (22 di in a Almonium Massily Payman is a stock policy of the paymait of 1100 or in light of (1) (22 di in a Almonium Massily Payman is a stock policy of the Almonium Massily Payman is a stock policy of the Paym

player will be applicable to your discount:

Annual Membership Ass—Thou pape in Day up when bliefe such your lipidoptic to applicable
infered being a mem-whether bound controlled by the or the mount juried in the fibbs of
infered being a mem-whether bound controlled by
the controlled by the controlled by the controlled by the controlled by
the player of the program of their brook and depressent, whether or happened
to the program of the program of their brook and appressent
coded got right to interest year decrease.

Lets Fase, I was do not seed he a personal bear year in all styll the amount of your Mahimum
Membery Experience and the to be philosope to the program of the day
to be annual to you only note the promone, or we must private controlled by the
Personn Cou D.N.

Beauth Payershin to a "Your bank days only broom that cheek or dead deby you and the promone of the promone of the program of the days
and the program of the controlled by the promone, or we must private a controlled by the
Personn Cou D.N.

Beauth Payershin to a "Your bank days only broom that cheek or dead deby you and the program of the days
and the program of the controlled by the promone of the program of the days
and the program of the controlled by the promone of the program of the program of the days
and the program of the controlled by the promone of the program of the days
and the program of the program of the program of the program of the days
and the program of the program

The Agraemon speeder to delig companished al Feunce Charges literasis, The Pender ENANCE CHARGES are subject to charge as destribed in the Periment Sections Invest institution services, Charges in the Agreement, and, where between Historical Education for Care Payme and Head-Reymont.

many sales

ІМІ-ОВЦУИІ УССОЛИІ ІИЕОВИРІЛОМ ЕИСГОЗЕВ

	1848년 1948년 (- / 1988년 1848년 1849년				RAMAN DI SELENIA PLA PER SENE BYNKEONE
€.		ind a more of the first and th	Chairm (Revis pilet) Indications in the chairm (Inde to be considered in the chairm).	The best of the property of the best of th	INTORTANT NOTICE FOR BANK ONE CREDIT CAD CUSTOMERS AROUT CHANGES TO YOUR RANK ONE CREDITIONS AROUT CHANGES TO YOUR RANK ONE CREDITIONERS AGRICUATION RECORDS R
	-	en del me este in many di tre qui et de spress (piese del physio) experçement est est halfes in best propries den bestef est del physios en entre mals is estrateg analysis pages.	The state of the s	And the intervalves of control of the provided for the local control of the provided for th	Condition of them proved panel Le best 1100 for the thirty of the contribute librarie Le best 1100 for the thirty of the contribute librarie Lemma description for the contribute librarie Lemma description for the contribute librarie Lemma description for the contribute librarie Lemma description Lemma descrip
		amber in personnel del Res. Il de sociedad person Liem bereicht der States describ geneichte perdet peut in des Index.	Middle Bern Mar 18 Francisco de la merci (de establica francisco de la merci de establica francisco de la delegió de la merci del merci del merci de la merci de la merci del merci.	Description of Commerce Code Description of Code	A COUNTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PA
_	נופנו און עלון אין א	Theorem has been by Frequent and American Marchael Andreas Marchael Andreas Marchael Andreas Marchael Andreas Marchael Andreas Andreas Andreas Marchael Andreas Andreas Marchael	The property of the control of the c	med lands to a be specified to the Deback Interaction and a land to the process of the Constitution of the	The definition with a final of them the life is that the many is defined as the final of the definition of the definitio
_					:

The product of the control of the co		The late of the common of the	
the property of the many terms of the manual decreasing the property of the manual decreasing the property of the manual decreasing the property of the proper		The made of the grant of the second of the s	·
·····		PREMINENT MANAGEMENT OF THE AMERICAN PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY	
Exhiming the color of the color		the gray between the many through the mean all the means the property of the property of the means the means the property of the property of the means the property of	-
	•	Extraction of the control of the con	

WAS TO THE STATE OF THE STATE O

Dispute or Legal Department

Chase Manhattan Bank, NA PO Box 15299 Wilmington, DE 19850-5299

Re: Account 4417124191217329

July 25, 2005

Certified Mail Number: 0304 1070000173924560

Dear Chase Manhattan Bank, NA Dispute Department:

FIRST NOTICE OF BILLING ERRORS

Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1666, I am writing you at the address on my billing statements to be used for billing inquiries within sixty days of receiving a statement of my account dated July 8, 2005 in connection with extensions of consumer credit: I hereby provide you notice that I believe said statement contains errors in the total amount you allege to be due, and other more specific items, as laid out more completely below. My belief that the statement contains billing errors under 15 U.S.C. 1666(b)(1), (2) and (5) is based upon my belief that you failed to give all the proper disclosures required by law to me prior to opening this account, and additional disclosures since then. Because you failed to provide these disclosures, the account could not legally be opened and I should not be responsible for the payment of interest, fees or other finance charges. While I understand I will likely still be responsible for the repayment of purchases and cash advances, I do not believe I should be responsible for interest, finance charges and other fees. As I have made payments on this account that have been applied to these improper charges the items I claim are billing errors are improperly reflected on the statements in the incorrect amount and/or inaccurate due to a computational or accounting error.

DISPUTE OF OBLIGATION AND BILLING ERROR PURSUANT TO 15 U.S.C. 1666(b)(1) and (5)

Because I believe I should not have been charged finance charges or fees for the history of this account, I dispute the accuracy of the following items on my statements which have been calculated based on the inclusion of those charges: the current balance, the amounts and payments due and all finance charges and other fees charged since this account was opened. The exact amount of all such previous finance charges and fees hereby disputed will be determined after you provide the documentary evidence requested below. More specifically, I dispute the accuracy of the following amounts listed on the statement dated July 8, 2005:

- 1.the alleged current balance of \$5,407.82,
- 2.the alleged finance charges of \$57.52, and
- 3.the minimum payment allegedly due of \$108.00.

BILLING ERROR PURSUANT TO 15 U.S.C. 1666(b)(2)

Because your claim as to my indebtedness rests on the existence of the alleged account and cardholder agreement, if the account was not able to be opened properly because of your failure to give the disclosures, then the amount of the indebtedness is called into question. Therefore, I request the documentary evidence of indebtedness detailed below. The statement contains billing errors under 15 U.S.C. 1666(b)(2) in that the statements reflect inaccuracies through their individual items, the entire balance due, finance charges and all extensions of consumer credit for which you claim I am indebted to

R14

you, and I request additional clarification regarding all such extensions of consumer credit, including all documentary evidence thereof you possess or are able to obtain, specifically including, but not limited to the following:

- Copies of all records of my written and signed authorizations for any purchases from all vendors for which an extension of consumer credit is claimed to have been made.
- 2. For any claimed extension of consumer credit where there is not a written authorization signed by me, a copy of all records of evidence of any other authorization by me, such as use of my PIN, or other identifying information.
- 3. If you claim any extension of consumer credit where you have no proof of authorization by me, a statement by you of the factual and legal basis of your claim that I am indebted to you for such an extension of consumer credit, or payment to any third party.
- 4.Copies of documents showing that all disclosures required by law that were given to me prior to opening this account, at any renewing of the account, and otherwise; including documentary evidence that any such disclosure was made to me, by whom, when, how and where.
- 5. The original cardholder agreement to which you allege I first agreed to, as well as any amendments you allegedly made thereto.
- 6.An accounting of all interest, fees, or other charges assessed to my account since it was opened.
- 7.Clarification of the amount(s) that I will need to pay pending the resolution of this billing error dispute and when such amounts will need to be paid.
- 8.Any other documents you allege, suggest or will rely upon to prove in a court of law or other dispute resolution forum, that I am indebted to you in the amount alleged.

I expect a prompt written response to this billing error dispute and request for documentary evidence made under the FCBA. I wish to make it clear that the forwarding of nothing but copies of previous statements or form letters will not suffice to fulfill this clear request for both specific and general documentation. I sincerely hope that we can come to a quick and mutually beneficial agreement as to how to settle this bona fide dispute. However, should you ignore this matter, I will pursue relief through any and all means legally available to me. Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mrs Evelyn L Hillis

Mrs. Evely L. Dillis

P.S. Feel free to call me at home na if you have any questions on this account.

AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION Commercial Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between

Re: 55 148 E 00131 06

Evelyn L. Hillis

(Claimant/Hillis)

and

Chase Bank USA, N.A.

(Respondent/Chase)

AWARD OF THE ARBITRATOR

I, THE UNDERSIGNED ARBITRATOR, having been designated in accordance with the arbitration agreement entered into between the above-named parties, and having been duly swom, and having duly heard the proofs and allegations of the Respondent, and the Claimant having failed to appear after due notice by mail in accordance with the Supplementary Procedures for Consumer-Related Disputes, do hereby, AWARD, as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Claimant, Evelyn L. Hillis ("Hillis") opened a credit card account with Respondent, Chase Bank USA, N.A. ("Chase") in August 2003 (the "Account").
- 2. With the opening of the Account, Chase provided Hillis with a Cardmember Agreement ("CMA") that set forth the terms and conditions of the Account. Among other terms, the CMA discloses the applicable finance charges, the methods used to calculate those charges, the applicable interest rates, and Hillis' payment obligations. The CMA states that use of the Account confirms Hillis' acceptance of the terms and conditions contained in the CMA.
- 3. Hillis first used the Account in October 2004 when she cashed a convenience check in the amount of \$3,000.00. In accordance with the CMA, Chase imposed the applicable finance charges and fees associated with that transaction, as Hillis' November 8, 2004, Account statement reflects.
- 4. Hillis used the Account only one other time, cashing another convenience check in the amount of \$2,850.00. In accordance with the CMA, Chase again imposed the applicable finance charges and fees associated with that transaction. These charges appeared on Hillis' December 8, 2004 statement.

- 5. In addition to the finance charges that appeared on Hillis' November 8, 2004 and December 8, 2004 statements, finance charges also appeared on each of her monthly statements from January 8, 2005 through June 8, 2005.
- 6. By letter dated March 29, 2005, Hillis communicated with Chase. In her letter, which Chase received on April 12, 2005, Hillis states that the letter is Chase's "official notice of a billing error dispute." Hillis references the FCBA in the letter, but does not allege any specific violation of that statute. She also does not identify any specific transaction or charge that she disputes.
- 7. On April 15, 2005; Chase responded to Hillis' March 29 letter, rejected its validity and reminded her of her obligations under the CMA.
- 8. On June 1, 2005, Chase received another letter from Hillis, identical to that received on April 12, 2005. Chase did not respond to this second letter.
- 9. On July 25, 2005, Hillis sent Chase a letter entitled "First Notice of Billing Errors." Chase received this letter on July 30, 2005. According to the letter, Hillis was disputing the Account balance reflected on her July 8, 2005 monthly statement. Hillis based her alleged dispute upon her "belief that [Chase] failed to give all the proper disclosures required by law ... prior to opening [the Account], and additional disclosures since then." The letter further asserted that because Chase "failed to provide these disclosures, the [A]ccount could not legally be opened and I should not be responsible for the payment of interest, fees or other finance charges." The letter did not specify what disclosures have not been made, nor did it specify any transaction that Hillis was disputing.
- 10. Although Hillis acknowledged in her July 25 letter that she owed the principal amount due on the Account, she also stated that she was "disputing" the "individual items, the entire balance due, finance charges and all extensions of consumer credit for which you claim I am indebted to you." She then requested eight categories of documents, including copies of her signed credit card receipts and lain accounting of all interest, fees, or other finance charges assessed to my account since it was opened."
- 11. Chase sent a response to Hillis on August 29, 2005, to her July 25, 2005 letter, again reminding her of her obligations pursuant to the CMA and rejecting her claim that she was not responsible for the balance due and owing on the Account.

12. Hillis sent a letter to Chase every month from August 2005 through February 2006. Each of these letters was identical to Hillis' July 25, 2005 letter, containing the same assertions and referring to that month's Account statement as containing unspecified billing errors.

Conclusions of Law

- 1. The Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq. ("TILA"), governs Hillis' claim. The purpose of TILA is to "assure meaningful disclosure of credit terms so that the consumer will be able to compare more readily the various credit terms available to him and avoid the uninformed use of credit, and to protect the consumer against inaccurate and unfair credit billing and credit card practices." 15 U.S.C. § 1601(a). Congress delegated to the Federal Reserve Board responsibility for developing regulations for implementing TILA. The Federal Reserve Board regulations are contained in 12 C.F.R., Part 226 (known as "Regulation Z").
- 2. The procedures for resolving credit billing disputes appear in Part D (Chapter 5) of TILA at 15 U.S.C. §§ 1666-1666j (and the implementing Regulation Z, at 12 C.F.R. § 226.13). This portion of TILA contains the FCBA. The FCBA defines what constitutes a "billing error" at 15 U.S.C. § 1666(b).
- 3. The FCBA and Regulation Z specify how such proper billing errors must be addressed. First, the creditor must receive written notice of a billing error within 60 days after a consumer has received the first credit card statement reflecting the billing error. Second, the creditor must send the consumer a written acknowledgement of the notice within 30 days. Third, the creditor must within two complete billing cycles after receipt of the notice (but not later than 90 days) either (1) make appropriate corrections to the account and send notification of those corrections to the consumer; or (2) send a written explanation or clarification to the consumer after having conducted an investigation, setting forth the reasons why the creditor believes the statement was correct. 15 U.S.C. § 1666(a); 12 C.F.R. § 226.13(b).
 - 4. Regulation Z defines a billing error notice as a written notice from a consumer that:
 - (1) Is received by a creditor ... no later than 60 days after the creditor transmitted the first periodic statement that reflects the alleged billing error;
 - (2) Enables the creditor to identify the consumer's name and account number; and

(3) To the extent possible, indicates the consumer's belief and the reasons for the belief that a billing error exists, and the type, date, and amount of the error.

12 C.F.R. § 226.13(b).

- 5. TILA is a consumer protection statute, but it is not to be used as an "instrument of harassment and oppression of the lending industry." *Greisz v. Household Bank*, 8 F. Supp. 2d 1031, 1036 (N.D. III. 1998), aff'd, 176 F.3d 1012 (7th Cir. 1999).
- 6. The creditor's obligations under the FCBA are triggered only if the consumer (1) identifies a billing error as defined by the FCBA; and (2) sends a written notice of that billing error to the creditor within 60 days of the first statement containing the purported error. 12 C.F.R. § 226.13(b)(1); Dawkins v. Sears Roebuck & Co., 109 F.3d 241, 243 (5th Cir. 1997), also at 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 12696, *4; Pinner v. Schmidt, 805 F.2d 1258, 1264 (5th Cir. 1986). Here, Hillis did neither.
- 7. Chase's obligations under the FCBA were never triggered because Hillis failed to identify any billing errors as defined by the FCBA. The letters upon which Hillis bases her claim, and the billing statements to which they relate, are void of any billing errors.
- 8. There is no legal support for Hillis' claim that a creditor's alleged failure to provide disclosures when an account is opened results in a billing error. Neither TILA, the FCBA nor Regulation Z provides support for a claim that a failure to make required disclosures results in a subsequent billing error as to any or all finance charges or fees.
- 9. Hillis' assertions in her letters that the Account could not be legally opened due to Chase's purported failure to provide her with pre-lending disclosures and that Chase cannot enforce the parts of the CMA relating to finance charges and other fees, are contrary to established case law. See Adams v. Trust Co. Bank, 426 S.E.2d 36, 38 (Ct. App. Ga. 1992) (Violations of the Truth in Lending Act or the Consumer Leasing Act "give rise to the remedies prescribed therein, and do not serve to invalidate the contract or prevent a lender or lessor from enforcing its rights under the contract."); First Nat'l Bank v. Felt, 368 N.W.2d 588, 591 (S.D. 1985) ("A failure to comply with [TILA] does not render the underlying obligation unenforceable."); Wise Furniture v. Dehning, 343 N.W.2d 26, 30 (Minn. 1984) ("It is important to note though that TILA violation does not affect the validity or enforceability of the

CaSasSe: 02795√r00-20203-25LL-IDX6Cum Protc2.654-9n1 1 Fileitle 013/03/202020007 Patgrag te41eff df616 Feb. 13. 2007 11:11AM No. 3529 P. 7

underlying contract."); Charter Finance Co. v. Henderson, 326 N.E.2d 372, 329 (III. 1975); Grandway Credit Corp. v. Brown, 295 So.2d 714, 715 (Fla. App. 1974).

- 10. To the extent that Hillis' letter may be construed as contending that the finance charge is itself a billing error, she is incorrect. This claim does not fit the three definitions of billing error cited in her letters, or any of the other definitions in Section 1666(b). A finance charge is "any charge payable directly or indirectly by the consumer and imposed directly or indirectly by the creditor as an incident to or a condition of the extension of credit." 12 C.F.R. § 226.4.
- Hillis refers to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1666(b)(1), (b)(2) and (b)(5) in her letters, but she fails to satisfy any of those definitions of "billing error." Section 1666(b)(1) defines a billing error as "[a] reflection on a statement of an extension of credit which was not made to the obligor or, if made, was not in the amount reflected on such statement." Section 1666(b)(2) defines a billing error as "[a] reflection on a statement of an extension of credit for which the obligor requests additional clarification including documentary evidence thereof." Both types of billing errors arise out of an underlying "statement of an extension of credit" that the consumer disputes or questions. As set forth above, however, finance charges by definition are not "an extension of credit", but rather are "incident to or a condition of the extension of credit. Compare 15 U.S.C. § 1666(b)(2) with 12 C.F.R. § 226.4(a). Section 1666(b)(5) defines a billing error as "[a] computational error or similar error of an accounting nature of the creditor on a statement." Hillis fails to identify any such error in her letters.
- Hillis' claim also fails because Hillis failed to notify Chase of the purported errors within 60 days from the first time the alleged errors were reflected on her billing statements. Regulation Z provides that the creditor must receive the billing error notice no later than 60 days after the creditor transmitted the first periodic statement that reflects the alleged billing error. 12 C.F.R. § 226.13(b)(1); Dawkins v. Sears Roebuck & Co., 109 F.3d at 243, also at 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 12696 at *4; Pinner v. Schmidt, 805 F.2d 1258, 1264 (50 Cir. 1986). If written notice is not received within this sixty day period, the billing error is not timely and the creditor is not required to take any action to respond under the FCBA or Regulation Z. Dawkins, 109 F.3d at 243, also at 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 12696 at *4; Greisz v. Household Bank, 8 F. Supp.2d at 1042 (because Greisz did not send a proper written billing error notice

CaSes2: 02795vr00-2020-25LL-ID60cum erotc2t64en1 1 Filleitle013/03/20/20/20/20707 Pagaegte51of df616

Feb. 13. 2007 11: 11AM No. 3529 P. 8

to Household within the requisite amount of time, her FCBA/TILA claim was dismissed on summary judgment), aff'd, 176 F.3d 1012, 1015 (7th Cir. 1999) (Plaintiff's FCBA claim and certain other TILA claims "were properly rejected on summary judgment and we have nothing to add to the District Judge's discussion of those claims"). Sending notice within sixty days of subsequent statements that might also reflect the purported billing error does not suffice or trigger any obligations either, because there is no "continuing billing error" concept embodied or permitted under the FCBA and Regulation Z. Dawkins, 109 F.3d at 243 n.1, also at 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 12696 at *5 n.1.

- 13. Hillis was first assessed a finance charge on the Account on her November 8, 2004 statement. According to Hillis' argument that she should not have been charged finance charges due to Chase's supposed failure to make mandatory disclosures when the Account was opened two years earlier, the deadline for providing Chase with a written notice of billing error was 60 days from the date the November 8, 2004 statement was transmitted, because this was the first time finance charges are known to have appeared on the Account. She did not send her first letter until July 25, 2005, which was over six months past the 60-day deadline from the first, November 8, 2004 statement, to contain finance charges.
- 14. Under 15 U.S.C. § 1640(e), Hillis was required to commence this arbitration within one year of the date of the occurrence of the alleged violation. Under the applicable case law, the one-year statute could have begun at one of two different points in time. Under either, however, the statute of limitations expired before Hillis initiated this arbitration. If Hillis is claiming that she did not receive the required disclosures at the opening of the Account, then the statute of limitations would have begun running at the time she should have received the disclosures, which would have been when the Account was opened. Goldman v. The First National Bank of Chicago, 532 F.2d 10, 17 (7th Cir. 1976). If she is claiming that the disclosures were made but were inaccurate or not "proper," the statute would have begun running when the first finance charge was imposed. Id. at 21. Hillis' action is barred under either situation. The Account was opened in August 2003 and the first finance charge was assessed on the November 8, 2004 statement. At the latest, Hillis had to bring an action by November 8, 2005. Instead, she initiated this arbitration on March 12, 2006, more than four months after the expiration of the statute of limitations. Her claims are therefore time-barred.

ACCORDINGLY, I award as follows: all claims of Evelyn L. Hillis, Claimant, are denied; the Award is entered in favor of Respondent, Chase Bank U.S.A., N.A.

The administrative fees of the American Arbitration Association totaling \$1,250.00 shall be borne as incurred, and the compensation and expenses of the arbitrator totaling \$5,990.79 shall be borne as incurred.

This Award is in full settlement of all claims submitted to this Arbitration. All claims, not expressly granted herein, are hereby denied.

2/13/07 Date

David J. Armstrong

I, David J. Armstrong, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument which is my Award.

Z/13/07

David Armstrong